in his answer,[3] endeavoured to shew,; that if these writers had considered the plastic natures only as instruments in the hand of God, this system would have been exposed to all the difficulties to which the Cartesian hypothesis is liable, and wbicbthey intend to avoid. That therefore we must suppose their opinion to have been, that these natures are active principles, which do not watot to be continually set on and directed; but that it is sufficient, if God does but put them in a proper situation, and superintend their actions, to set them right, if it be necessary. This being the * case, Monsieur Bayle pretends, that the'argument may be retorted against those writers. For, says he, since when the order and regularity of .this world are alleged as a proof of .the' being *®f* m God, it is supposed that a being cannot produce a regular work, without having an idea of it; yet, according to Dr. Cud worth, the plastic natures, which produce plants and animals, haw not the least idea of what they do. If it be answer-, ed, that they have been created with that faculty by«a Being, who knows all, and whose ideas they only put in execution; the Stratonician will; reply, that if they do it only as efficient causes, this is as incomprehensible as that which is objected to him; since it is as difficult for any feeing to perform a scheme, which it does not understand, '. but which another understands, as it is to perform a scheme which no being at ajl has any notion of. Since you acknowledge, will the Stratonician say, that God could endow some creatures with a power of producing excellent w^rks, though without any knowledge: you niu^t also confers,

* Hist, des -Quvrag-es des ScaVans,; Ap&t 1704. Art. 7,

p. 380, &c*